



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignita 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/973,847 | 10/11/2001 | Toshiyuki Kasai | 110837 | 9089 | |
| 25944 | 7590 07/16/2003 | | | | |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC | | | EXAMI | EXAMINER | |
| | P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 | | | ALPHONSE, FRITZ | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2675 | [0] | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | γ | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
| Office Action Comment | 09/973,847 | KASAI, TOSHIYUKI | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Fritz Alphonse | 2675 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet | with the correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the me earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may reply within the statutory minimum of od will apply and will expire SIX (6) No tute, cause the application to become | r a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. IONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 | 1 October 2001 . | | | | | |
| 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ | This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicat | ion. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | • | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami | ner. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. | | | | | | |
| 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the | Examiner. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-1948) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 5) Notice | ew Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 04-01) Office | Action Summary | Part of Paper No. 10 | | | | |

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Okuda (U.S. Pat. No. 6,380,689).

As to claims 1, 2, Okuda (figs. 2, 5, 6) show a driving circuit for actively driving an organic electroluminescent display device (col. 1, lines 6-9) in which a plurality of pixels (note that the panel has a plurality of pixel elements $10_{i,j}$, see figure 6), each containing an organic electroluminescent element ($E_{i,j}$), are arranged in a matrix (col. 3, lines 31-34), the driving circuit comprising: a reverse-bias setting circuit (see figure 6) which sets the organic electroluminescent elements to a reverse-bias state on an area-by-area basis (col. 5, lines 11-24).

Art Unit: 2675

As to claims 3-4 and 13-14, Okuda (fig. 6) discloses a driving circuit, wherein the reverse-bias setting circuit including a switch (6₁)which switches an electrical connection state of at least one of electrodes of each of the organic electroluminescent elements between being connected to a first power source line (Va) that supplies a first potential and being connected to a second power source line (-Ve) that supplies a second potential that is lower in level than the first potential.

Page 3

As to claims 5-6 and 15-16, Okuda (fig. 6) discloses a driving circuit, wherein the switches being arranged with one switch for each pixel, so that the organic electroluminescent elements being set to be in a reverse-bias state on a pixel-by-pixel basis by controlling the switches (note in figures 5, 6, switches (6₁) are arranged for each pixel elements 10_{i, j}, and the reverse bias voltage is applied to each EL device; see abstract).

As to claims 7-8 and 17-18, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 5-6, therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 5-6 above.

As to claim 9, Okuda (figs. 2, 5, 6) show a driving circuit for driving an electro-optical device in which a plurality of electro-optical elements are arranged in a matrix, the driving circuit comprising: a reverse-bias setting circuit (see figure 6) which sets at least one of the electro-optical elements to a reverse-bias state (col. 5, lines 11-24).

As to claim 10, the claim differs from claim 1 by the additional limitation "a piece of electronic equipment, comprising: an active-matrix display device". However, this limitation is clearly disclosed by Okuda (see abstract).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2675

As to claims 11 and 12, the claims have substantially the limitations of claims 1 and 2,

therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claims 1 and 2 above.

As to claim 19, Okuda (figs. 2, 5, 6) show an electro-optical device, comprising: a plurality

of electro-optical elements (note that the panel has a plurality of pixel elements $10_{i,j}$; see figure 6);

and a driving circuit (see figure 6) that drives the plurality of electro-optical elements, the driving

circuit including a reverse-bias setting circuit which sets at least one of the plurality of electro-optical

elements to a reverse-bias state (col. 5, lines 11-24; see abstract).

As to claim 20, Okuda discloses an electro-optical device, wherein the electro-optical element

being an organic electroluminescent element (col. 1, lines 6-9).

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Okuda et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,844,368) discloses a driving system for driving luminous

elements.

Ishizuka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,923,307) discloses a display device using current driven type

light emitting elements.

Nagayama et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,949,186) discloses an organic electroluminescent element.

Howard et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,023,259) discloses an OLED active matrix using a single

transistor current mode pixel design.

Page 5

Art Unit: 2675

Ochi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,376,994) discloses an organic EL device driving apparatus having temperature compensating function.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse whose telephone number is (703) 308-8534.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington.

VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

. Alphonse

Art Unit: 2675

July 11, 2003

DENNIS-DOON CHOW